

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
AND
PRIVACY ACTS

Subject: HISS - Chambers

File Number: 65-14920

Section: Vol. 49

Serials 5810 - 5936



FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

NOTICE

THE BEST COPIES OBTAINABLE ARE INCLUDED IN THE REPRODUCTION OF THE FILE. PAGES INCLUDED THAT ARE BLURRED, LIGHT OR OTHERWISE DIFFICULT TO READ ARE THE RESULT OF THE CONDITION AND OR COLOR OF THE ORIGINALS PROVIDED. THESE ARE THE BEST COPIES AVAILABLE.

65-14920

Vol 49

Serials 5810 - 5936

prepaid
N.Y.

65

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo /-Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5810	3/10/52	Baltimore letter to Bureau	3	Yes	
5811	3/11/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5812	3/11/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5813	3/11/52	Baltimore teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5814	3/11/52	New York letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5815	3/12/52	Bureau teletype to New York and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5815A	3/12/52	New York Report	34	Yes	
5816	3/10/52	Pittsburgh Report	3	Yes	
5817	3/11/52	Baltimore letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5818	3/12/52	Washington Field Office Memo to Bureau	1	Yes	
5819	3/13/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5820	3/13/52	Philadelphia teletype to Bureau, New York and Boston	1	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo / -Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5821	3/13/52	New York teletype to Bureau, Boston, Chicago and Baltimore	5	Yes	
5822	3/13/52	Bureau teletype to New York and Boston	2	Yes	
5823	3/13/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5824	3/13/52	New York Memo to Boston	1	No	Released in full
5825	3/13/52	New York letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5826	3/10/52	Norfolk letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5827	3/10/52	Denver letter to Bureau	5	Yes	
5828	3/12/52	Philadelphia letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5829	3/14/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5830	3/14/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5830A	3/14/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5831	3/14/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo / -Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5832	3/14/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5833	3/14/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5833A	3/14/52	New York teletype to Bureau	1	Yes	
5834	3/15/52	Baltimore teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5835	3/15/52	Miami teletype to Bureau, New York and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5836	3/15/52	Baltimore teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5837	3/15/52	Chicago teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5837A	3/15/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5837B	3/15/52	New York teletype to Bureau, Boston and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5838	3/15/52	Chicago teletype to Bureau and New York	3	Yes	
5838A	3/15/52	New York letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5838B	3/15/52	New York Memo to Bureau	1	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo /-Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5838C	3/15/52	New York Memo to Bureau	1	Yes	
5839	3/10/52	Norfolk letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5840	3/10/52	Newark Memo to Bureau	1	Yes	
5841	3/13/52	Washington Field Office letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5842	3/14/52	Newark Report	4	Yes	
5843	3/15/52	Bureau Memo to New York	2	Yes	
5844	3/15/52	Baltimore letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5845	3/17/52	New York Memo to Los Angeles	1	No	Released in full
5845A	3/17/52	Rap Sheet (Leisman)	6	Yes	
5845B	3/17/52	Bureau Memo to New York	1	Yes	
5846	3/17/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Los Angeles 2		Yes	
5847	3/17/52	Bureau teletype to Boston, Newark and New York	1	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
.49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo / -Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5848	3/17/52	Boston teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5849	3/17/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5850	3/17/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Los Angeles	1	Yes	
5851	3/18/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5851A	3/12/52	New York Report	34	Yes	
5852	3/18/52	Baltimore teletype to Bureau, Washington Field Office and New York	1	Yes	
5853	3/19/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5854	3/18/52	New York teletype to Bureau	1	Yes	
5855	3/19/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Baltimore	3	Yes	
5855A		(Serial Transferred To 100-115461)			
5856	3/19/52	Bureau Memo to Mobile	1	Yes	
5856A	3/19/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo / -Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5857	3/20/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Baltimore	3	Yes	
5858	3/20/52	Bureau teletype to New York, Boston and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5859	3/20/52	Baltimore teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5860	3/20/52	Boston teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5861	3/20/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5862	3/18/52	Miami Report	2	Yes	
5863	3/7/52	Letter	1	Yes	
5863	3/20/52	Routing Slip Bureau to New York (above letter enclosure)	1	Yes	
5864	3/7/52	Letter	1	Yes	
5864	3/20/52	Routing Slip Bureau to New York (above letter enclosure)	1	Yes	
5865	3/21/52	New York teletype to Bureau, Los Angeles and Chicago	1	Yes	
5866	3/21/52	New York teletype to Bureau	1	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo / -Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5867	3/21/52	Los Angeles teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5868	3/21/52	Washington Field Office teletype to Baltimore and New York	1	Yes	
5868A	3/21/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Baltimore	4	Yes	
5869	3/21/52	New York letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5870	3/22/52	Baltimore teletype to Bureau and New York	4	Yes	
5870A	Undated	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5870B	3/22/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5870C	3/22/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Los Angeles	1	Yes	
5871	3/24/52	New York teletype to Bureau	1	Yes	
5872	3/24/52	Baltimore teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5873	3/21/52	Chicago Report	3	Yes	
5874	3/22/52	Baltimore Report	16	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo / Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5874A	3/24/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Boston	3	Yes	
5875	3/22/52	Baltimore letter to Bureau	5	Yes	
5876	3/25/52	Bureau teletype to New York and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5877	3/25/52	Bureau teletype to New York and Boston	2	Yes	
5878	3/24/52	Boston Report	5	Yes	
5879	3/26/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5880	3/26/52	Bureau teletype to New York	2	Yes	
5881	3/26/52	New York teletype to Bureau	1	Yes	
5881A	3/25/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5881B	3/26/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5882	3/27/52	Baltimore teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5883	3/26/52	Bureau letter to Baltimore	1	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
.49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo /-Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5884	3/27/52	Bureau Memo to New York	1	Yes	
5885	3/29/52	New York teletype to Bureau, Baltimore	3	Yes	
5886	3/29/52	New York Memo	5	Yes	
5886A	3/29/52	New York Memo	14	Yes	
5886B	3/31/52	Memo	1	No	Released in full
5887	3/28/52	Bureau Memo to New York	1	Yes	
5888	3/13/52	New York Routing Slip with letter to Bureau	2	Yes	
5888A	3/31/52	Memo	1	No	Released in full
5889	3/31/52	New York Memo to Bureau, Boston and Baltimore	2	Yes	
5890	4/1/52	Boston teletype to Bureau and New York	2	Yes	
5891	4/1/52	New York letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5892	4/2/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Boston	2	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE 6/77

(Mo /-Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5893	4/2/52	New York Memo to Bureau	1	Yes	
5894	4/3/52	New York Memo to Baltimore	1	No	Released in full
5895	4/3/52	Baltimore teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5896	4/3/52	New York teletype to Bureau	1	Yes	
5897	4/3/52	Boston teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5898	4/4/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Boston	1	Yes	
5899	4/4/52	Boston teletype to Bureau and New York	3	Yes	
5900	4/7/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5901	4/7/52	Chicago teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5902	4/7/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Boston	1	Yes	
5903	4/8/52	Albany teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5904	4/8/52	Chicago teletype to New York	2	No	Released in full

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77
(Mo / Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5905	4/9/52	Boston teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5906	4/7/52	New York Memo	2	No	(see attached)
5907	4/9/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5908	4/9/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5909	4/9/52	Baltimore letter to Bureau	5	Yes	
5910	4/10/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5911	4/10/52	New York Memo	2	No	Released in full
5912	4/10/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Boston	1	Yes	
5913	4/10/52	Los Angeles teletype to Bureau and New York	2	Yes	
5914	4/11/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Boston	1	Yes	
5915	4/11/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Boston	2	Yes	
5916	4/11/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:New York
65-14920
49

RE: _____

DATE 6/77
(Mo / Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5917	4/10/52	Bureau letter to Baltimore	1	Yes	
5918	4/14/52	New York letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5918A	4/14/52	Boston Memo to New York	1	No	Released in full
5919	4/15/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Boston	1	Yes	
5920	4/15/52	Bureau teletype to New York and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5921	4/15/52	Boston teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	
5922	4/1/52	Memo SAC Boston	3	No	Released in full
5923	4/16/52	New York teletype to Bureau	1	Yes	
5924	4/16/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5925	4/16/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5926	4/16/52	Bureau teletype to New York	1	Yes	
5927	4/16/52	Boston teletype to Bureau and New York	1	Yes	

FIELD OFFICE
FILE NO:
VOL. NO:

New York
65-14920
49

INVENTORY WORKSHEET

RE: _____

DATE

6/77

(Mo / Yr)

SERIAL	DATE	DESCRIPTION (TYPE OF COMM, TO, FROM)	NO OF PGS	SENT TO BUREAU	BUFILE NOS. DIRECTED TO
5928	4/15/52	Bureau letter to New York	6	Yes	
5929	4/16/52	Bureau letter to New York	1	Yes	
5930	4/17/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5931	4/22/52	New York letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5932	4/22/52	New York letter to Bureau	1	Yes	
5933	4/22/52	New York Memo	1	No	Released in full
5933A	4/18/52	Bureau Memo to New York	12	Yes	
5934	4/23/52	New York teletype to Bureau and Baltimore	1	Yes	
5935	4/21/52	Bureau letter to Baltimore	1	Yes	
5936	4/23/52	New York Memo	2	No	Released in full

DOC. NO.	SERIAL NO.	DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENT	PAGES ACTUAL REL.	DELETION(S)	EXEMP- TION(S)	CROSS REF.
	5906	New York Memo 4/7/52	2: 2	<p>Page 1, paragraph 1. Symbol number of 1 confidential informant.</p> <p>Paragraph 2. Information concerning informant and Kirstein which would identify source.</p> <p>Paragraph 3. Information Kirstein gave informant which would identify source.</p> <p>Page 2, paragraph 2. Information that informant told Kirstein that would identify source.</p> <p>Paragraph 4. Information that Kirstein told informant that would identify informant.</p>	<p>(b) (7) (D)</p> <p>(b) (7) (D)</p> <p>(b) (7) (D)</p> <p>(b) (7) (D)</p> <p>(b) (7) (D)</p>	



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

March 13, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

At approximately 5:30 p.m. on March 12, 1952, a representative of the press dropped off a copy of a printed document entitled "SUPPLEMENTAL AFFIDAVITS SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL" in the above-captioned case. Mr. Whelan made this document available to the writer, who reviewed it and furnished Mr. Whelan with a general summary of its contents. Photostatic copies of it were prepared.

At 9:00 p.m. Mr. Whelan called Night Supervisor Martin at the Bureau and advised him that it appeared that these supplemental affidavits had been filed late on the afternoon of March 12 by HISS' attorneys, further advised him of the general contents, and requested that Martin telephonically advise Assistant Director Belmont of these facts. On the same evening a photostatic copy of the document was forwarded to the Bureau by mail to the special attention of Mr. Belmont.

On the morning of March 13 the writer checked with the Clerk of the Criminal Court, USDC, SDNY, and ascertained that the supplemental affidavits had been filed at about 4:00 p.m. on the afternoon of March 12. At 9:20 a.m. on March 13 Mr. Whelan telephonically advised Mr. Hennrich at the Bureau that these supplemental affidavits had been so filed.

J. J. DANAHY,
SA

JJD:RAA
65-14920

65-14920-5819

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAR 13 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

Spencer

SAC, Boston

3/13/52

SAC, New York (65-14920)

JAHAM

Re New York tel 3/13/52 relative to filing of supplemental affidavits by HISS defense.

There is attached one photostatic copy of the defense's Supplemental Affidavits in Support of Motion for New Trial for ALGER HISS.

Enc.

cc: Chicago (Enc.)
Baltimore (Enc.)

TGS:HC

65-14920-5824



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

March 14, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

On the afternoon of March 14, 1952, Supervisor Bill Branigan of the Bureau called and wanted further explanation of our teletype of March 13 concerning the reason why a lead was set out for the New York Office to attempt to locate the old Woodstock typewriter that had been rented by the HISS attorneys prior to the first trial.

Branigan was advised that the United States Attorney felt that the HISS people had rented the old Woodstock for some particular purpose and that purpose was never determined during the investigation or during both trials. The United States Attorney was of the opinion that possibly an attempt had been made prior to the first trial to substitute or change the old Woodstock to resemble in some fashion the HISS Woodstock machine, thereby indicating that forgery by typewriter had been considered as early as the Spring of 1949, and therefore this was not a new theory or newly-discovered evidence as the January 24 affidavit would make out.

Branigan was asked whether the Bureau had any objection to our handling this request of the United States Attorney, and he said the Bureau had no objection, but that they were preparing a memorandum for the Director based on New York teletype of March 13, and they wanted to be definitely sure of the reason for this part of the investigation. Branigan stated that the writer's explanation cleared this matter up and that we should of course run this lead out.

T. G. SPENCER,
SA

TGS:RAA
65-14920

65-14920-5829

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAR 14 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

15

New York, N. Y.

3/14/52

MEMO

RE: JAHAM

On 3/13/52 the writer talked to DON PARSONS in the Bureau's Laboratory and informed him that the album of photographs attached to the affidavit of NORMAN had been obtained by this office. He was informed that the New York office was sending this album, which was the United States Attorney's file copy, to the Bureau rather than taking photographs of it in view of the fact that some of the detail might be lost in this process. PARSONS was informed that these photographs were to be used in analyzing the affidavit of NORMAN.

PARSONS said they would handle this matter immediately upon the arrival in the Bureau of all material and would advise this office as soon as possible as to any conclusions or other ideas they might obtain as a result of their study.

THOMAS G. SPENCER, SA

cc: Asst. Dir. E. J. Connelley

TGS:HC
65-14920

65-14920-5830

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAR 14 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

Spencer

March 17, 1952

SAC, Los Angeles

SAC, New York (65-14920)

JAHAM


ReNYtel 3-17-52.

There is attached a photostatic copy of a supplemental affidavit of CHESTER T. LANE in support of motion for a new trial on the ground of newly-discovered evidence. This affidavit was filed in the Clerk's Office, Southern District of New York, on March 12, 1952. Upon receipt of this the Los Angeles Office should carry out the instructions set forth in reference teletype.

TGS:RAA

Enclosure

AIR MAIL - SPECIAL DELIVERY
REGISTERED MAIL



65-14920-1845mm
R

New York, N. Y.
3/18/52

MR. VERNON
MR. HARRITT
MR. TERRY
MR. GARDNER
MR. McANDREWS
NIGHT SUPERVISOR
MR. JAGAN
MR. SULLIVAN
MR. WALSH
MR. WHELAN
MR. WOOD
CHIEF CLERK
PROPERTY CLERK
TRAINING

Mr. Connelley

MEMO

Re: JAHAM

Inspector Carl Hennrich, Bureau, called at 3:15 P. M., 3/17/52, at which time he referred to NY tel to LA concerning interview with HOKANSON. Mr. Hennrich pointed out that Laboratory men had interviewed three individuals in Chicago who were with the Woodstock Typewriter Co. and that in all probability the interview with HOKANSON would be unnecessary particularly since he would be interviewed by agents and not by technical men. He said, however, he was leaving it to our discretion and if we felt the interview was not absolutely necessary, we should send a teletype cancelling it.

ROBERT R. GRANVILLE, SA

RRG:MFB

*Tel to L.A. 3/17/52
to hold in abeyance
mef*

65-14980-5857

SEARCHED..... INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED..... FILED.....

Spencer

Following the filing of a motion for a new trial on January 24, 1952 by the attorneys for ALGER HISS, the FBI conducted certain investigation. The purpose of this investigation was to assist the United States Attorney, Southern District of New York, in his preparation of the Government's answer to this defense motion.

One phase of the FBI's inquiry was concerned with determining the background and reputation of LOUIS J. LEISMAN, one of the affiants for the defense. During the course of this part of the investigation certain of LEISMAN's relatives in Philadelphia, Norfolk and Baltimore were interviewed.

On March 7, 1952, I received a letter from CHESTER T. LANE, in which he stated that an unnamed attorney in Baltimore had informed him that "the FBI have been harassing almost every member of his (LEISMAN's) family and that he, LEISMAN, is a Communist and requesting LEISMAN's address from them. LEISMAN is quite annoyed about this and regards it all as an effort to intimidate him."

On March 8, 1952, I informed the FBI of the allegation in CHESTER T. LANE's letter and requested that they determine whether the allegation had any merit. I have recently reviewed the facts pertaining to the interviews of LOUIS J. LEISMAN's relatives and find, (1) that the FBI has absolutely no information indicative of the fact that LEISMAN was or is a Communist and therefore statements that the Agents told LEISMAN's relatives that he was a Communist are utterly false and ridiculous; (2) the relatives of LEISMAN who were interviewed were definitely not harassed but on the contrary were most cooperative and therefore this allegation is absolutely unfounded.

8
65-14720 - 5870A

New York, N.Y.
3/22/52

MEMO

RE: JAHAM

The attached blind, undated memorandum was prepared by the writer upon instructions from U. S. Attorney MYLES LANE for his use in refuting the allegation of CHESTER T. LANE relative to alleged intimidation of LOUIS LEISMAN's relatives. LANE utilized this memorandum in his conference with Judge GODDARD on the afternoon of 3/21/52.

THOMAS G. SPENCER, SA

65-14920-5890B

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAR 26 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

WCH

TGS:HC
65-14920

MR. TOLSON	
MR. BOARDMAN	
MR. BELMONT	
MR. CLEGG	
MR. GLAVIN	
MR. LADD	
MR. NICHOLS	
MR. ROSEN	
MR. TRACY	
MR. WATSON	
MR. WILSON	
MR. YERGEN	
CHIEF CLERK	
TRAINING UNIT	

N. Foley

New York, N. Y.
3/25/52

MEMO

Re: JAHAM

I called Inspector Carl Hennrich, Bureau, and also spoke to Mr. N. P. Callahan in the matter of exchanging a typewriter which we had in storage for a Woodstock typewriter of the same vintage as the used typewriter which a local concern has and which the Bureau wants to conduct examinations with. Mr. Callahan advised that we should rent a typewriter from a recognized rental agency for the local concern rather than giving them a government typewriter. The rental charge should be paid for out of the Confidential Fund of NYO.

WILLIAM M. WHELAN, ASAC

WMW:MFB

65-1780-101A

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 1 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

[Signature]



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

March 26, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

Supervisor Nick Callahan of the Bureau telephonically advised ASAC Whelan that the New York Office should rent a typewriter to replace the one borrowed for Laboratory experiments.

SA D. E. Shannon was advised of this.

T. J. McANDREWS,
SA

TJMCA:RAA
65-14920

65-14920-5812

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAR 27 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

DE Shannon

With reference to the allegations made by Chester T. Lane on March 21 last, concerning the fact that because of the FBI's inquiries at the residence of Leisman's son the latter was being evicted and forced to find new living quarters, the following information is set forth:

Two personal interviews and two telephonic contacts were had with Mrs. Beatrice Burg of Aberdeen, Maryland, by an agent of the FBI. In connection with Leisman's son, Jackie, it has been determined that he was placed in the care of Mrs. Burg by either Leisman or his wife for a temporary period beginning about the latter part of February.

On February 29 Mrs. Burg was interviewed by an agent of the FBI, at which time she informed that she was "disappointed in having only received \$25 in consideration for room and board of Jack Leisman for a period of two weeks, and that this amount was insufficient to cover the cost of his care."

On March 20, 1952, Mrs. Burg was telephonically contacted, and she advised at this time that Leisman intended to visit her over the weekend of April 5 in connection with their boarding his son, Jackie. At this time on March 20 the boy, Jackie Leisman, was still living at the Burg residence in Aberdeen.

On both of the personal interviews with Beatrice Burg she was advised prior to commencing the interview that the FBI's interest in Leisman was not due to any criminal or subversive activities on his part and should not in any way reflect upon his character or that of anyone in his family.

Sergeant Sylvester Burg, Military Police, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Maryland, the husband of Beatrice Burg, was also interviewed at the Post Intelligence Office in Aberdeen, Maryland, and he related that although he had a great admiration for Leisman's son, Jack, he found Louis Leisman to be a particularly offensive individual and had no desire to associate with him or to confer with him any more than was necessary. He informed the agent at this time that Jackie Leisman was living in his residence in Aberdeen and that "I had better hear from him (the father) pretty soon. We've got his kid, you know, and we haven't got any money from him since the last time he was up." Sergeant Burg stated that he was reluctant to turn the boy out but just couldn't keep him any longer unless they received money for his care. At the time of this interview the agent informed Sergeant Burg that the eviction of Jack Leisman was a matter that should be considered independently of any investigation of the boy's father.

15-14973-588H

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAR 31 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

Spencer

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAR 31 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

General weakness also is
 fact he, Norman, refers to
 typewriters, etc as standards
 such as a number of Woodstock
 typewriters but offers no pictures
 of these as normal standards
 to be compared with suspected
 items from 230099 - his supposed
 standards could be ~~no~~ undoubtedly
 are not as he represents, by
 reason of his ineptness
 or intended deceit of presentation.

Here he has said things about
 230099 definitely not factual
 as to supposed corruption of
 230099, matters complained
 of being practices of manufacture
 in factory, ^{and} not irregular.

65-14570-5565

SAC, Baltimore

April 3, 1952

SAC, New York (65-14920)

JAHAM

There are attached for the information of the Baltimore Office two photostatic copies of an affidavit submitted by LOUIS J. LEISMAN and two photostatic copies of a statement of LEISMAN made before the USA, SDNY.

The Baltimore Office is requested to check the information appearing in the affidavit and the statement of LEISMAN against information appearing in Baltimore Office files regarding the investigation of LEISMAN in instant case. All discrepancies should be noted and forwarded to the Bureau and New York. No active investigation should be conducted by the Baltimore Office, until instructions are received from the Bureau or the New York Office.

TGS:RAA

Enclosures

65-14920-5894

NEW YORK 7 FROM CHICAGO

2

10-09 PM

SAC NEW YORK

U R G E N T

U R G E N T

MR. SCHMIDT
MR. WHELAN
MR. HARGETT
MR. GILLESPIE
MR. GRANVILLE
MR. HAMILTON
MR. LUVIS
MR. MARCHESAU
MR. McANDREWS
NIGHT SUPERVISOR
MR. FAGAN
MR. SULLIVAN
MR. WAISH
MR. WILLIS
MR. WOOD
CHIEF CLERK
PROPERTY CLERK

JAHAM, PERJURY, ESPIONAGE DASH R. RE CG TEL APRIL. SEVEN, YOUNGBERG FURNISHED SAS J. W. HAGEE AND H. H. WILLIS ON APRIL EIGHT, NINETEEN FIFTYTWO A SIGNED STATEMENT INCORPORATING IN SUBSTANCE THE FOLLOWING.. SEVERAL YEARS PRIOR TO NINETEEN THIRTY YOUNGBERG WAS ASST. SUPERINTENDENT AT THE WOODSTOCK CO. IN WHICH CAPACITY HE SUPERVISED ALL TYPEWRITER MFG. OPERATIONS. HE DESIGNED AND SET IN OPERATION THE PROCESS FOR SOLDERING TYPE TO TYPE BARS WHICH WAS IN OPERATION THE AROUND NINETEEN TWENTYNINE. BY MEANS OF EXPLAINING PROCESS HE SAID THAT INITIALLY THE TYPE BARS WERE COATED WITH COPPER, ASSEMBLED INTO THE TYPE BAR SEGMENT, AFTER WHICH THE TYPE WAS SOLDERED ONTO THE TYPE BARS AND EXCESS SOLDER BEING FILED OR GROUND OFF. FINALLY, BARS AND TTTTTTTTTT TYPE WERE NICKEL PLATED. ON INSPECTION OF FINISHED AT WOODSTOCK IN APPROXIMATELY NINETEEN TWENTYNINE CONSIDERABLE VARIATION IN THE GENERA APPEARANCE AND AMOUNT OF SOLDER ON THE ENDS OF THE BARS HAS BEEN NOTED. THESE WERE NOT REGARDED AS UNUSUAL OR DIFFERENT IN APPEARANCE FROM TYPE BARS PRODUCED WHILE HE WAS AT WOODSTOCK. ON EXAMINATION OF PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE ENDS OF TYPE BARS MARKED N TWO THREE ZERO ZERO NINE NINE HE COULD NOT STATE WHETHER THE SOLDERING OF TYPE TO THE TYPE BARS IS A FACTORY JOB. HE COULD NOT DO THIS BECAUSE

END PAGE ONE

65-14920

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 8 1952	
FBI NEW YORK	

T.D. Spencer

VZ

65-14920-5904

PAGE TWO

OF THE MAGNIFICATION AND LIGHT USED WHEN THE PHOTOGRAPHS WERE MADE. HE EXAMINED PHOTOGRAPHS MARKED M THREE EIGHT THREE, M THREE EIGHT FOUR, M THREE NINE ONE, AND M THREE NINE TWO AND STATED HE COULD RECALL NO CHANGE IN DIES AT THE WOODSTOCK CO. BETWEEN THE TIME TYPEWRITER NO. N TWO TWO EIGHT THREE ONE ZERO AND TYPEWRITER N TWO THREE THREE NINE FIVE FOUR WERE MADE. PHOTOGRAPHS M THREE EIGH THREE, M THREE EIGHT FOUR, M THREE EIGHT SEVEN, AND M THREE NINE ONE HAVE THE APPEARANCE OF TYPE FACES THAT HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY STRIKING THE "PAPER FINGER" ON THE TYPEWRITER OR STRIKING THE HEEL OF ANOTHER TYPE BAR IN MOTION. HE DID NOT CONSIDER IT POSSIBLE TO CHANGE CURVATURE OF THE SMALL LETTER T ON TYPE FACE WITHOUT THE TYPE FACE BEARING EVIDENCE OF MECHANICAL GRINDING OR ABRASION. FROM HIS EXPERIENCE TYPE AND TYPE BARS ARE NOT RENICKED AFTER TYPEWRITER REPAIRMEN RESOLDER AN OLD TYPE TO A BAR. NO CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF STEEL USED IN MAKING TYPE WAS MADE AT WOODSTOCK. ✓ ONE HUNDRED TYPEWRITERS WERE MFG-D DAILY THEN. YOUNGBERG HAS NOT BEEN CONTACTED BY HISS ATTORNEY. SA J. W. MAGEE ✓ DEPARTED CG SEVEN FIFTEEN PM APRIL EIGHT, NINETEEN FIFTYTWO VIA CITY OF LOS ANGELES, SCHEDULED TO ARRIVE LA NINE AM APRIL TEN, NINETEEN FIFTYTWO, OCCUPYING ROOMETTE TWO, CAR ONE ZERO THREE TWO. LA BEING ADVISED SEPARATELY OF MAGEE-S TRAVEL.

O-CONNOR.

CORR PLS LINE TWELVE PAGE ONE SHD READ AS THE END AS FOLLOWS-

"FINISHED BARS MADE"

KNXKNX

END AND ACK PLS

11-37 PM CGO R 7 NYC JLM

TU

New York, New York

[REDACTED]
April 7, 1952

MEMO:

RE: JAHAM
ESPIONAGE-R
PERJURY

[REDACTED] of known reliability, advised that she had a short conversation with ELINOR KIRSTEIN during which KIRSTEIN told her she was helping the HISS defense.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

KIRSTEIN said SY GERSON went to her for money for the defense of the C.P. leader's but her husband, GEORGE KIRSTEIN, would not contribute. GEORGE KIRSTEIN, according to Informant, is active in Americans for Democratic Action.

KIRSTEIN indicated she had evidence that CHAMBERS was out of the C.P. in 1937. KIRSTEIN also said typewriter evidence introduced at the HISS trial was faked but she did not say how.

KIRSTEIN apparently was interested in the date CHAMBERS left the Party. She indicated she had sought assistance from the C.P. in this respect but had been brushed off. KIRSTEIN felt the C.P. considered her a "police agent". She was bitter about this and said, "they made me spend hours and hours in the library when they could have helped me".

cc: 66-6350. (P & C)
100-13473 (Gerson)

JWD:LJR
65-14920

65-14920-5906

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 9 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

N3

Memo:
65-14920

Informant said that she herself knew CHAMBERS in 1935. She stated that it was well known around Greenwich Village that he was a Communist and that he was considered something of a pathological case. Informant has no idea what CHAMBERS did in the C.P. or when he left. Informant did not know HISS or his wife, but thinks she may have met Mrs. HISS at the school at which Mrs. HISS taught.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] She said the C.P. was tied to Russian foreign policy and that she considered it her duty to support the United States.

Informant said that KIRSTEIN's interest in HISS undoubtedly derives from her friendship with HISS' close friends, the BUTTENWEISERS. She said ELINOR married GEORGE KIRSTEIN at the BUTTENWEISER's home.

[REDACTED]

JOHN W. DOOLEY
SA



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

April 9, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

On March 28, 1952, HANNAH F. SULNER, who has previously given information in instant case regarding MARTIN K. TYTELL, personally appeared in the New York Office. She advised that subsequent to the conference she had with CHESTER LANE in connection with her possibly giving information regarding forged documents, she had on March 3, 1952, sent LANE a bill for \$50.00. This bill was for "CONFERENCE IN THE CASE OF ALGER HISS FOR APPEARING IN CONFERENCE ON FEBRUARY 25, 1952, AT THE RESIDENCE OF MISS BURTON, 55 MORTON STREET, NEW YORK. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES REFUSED."

Mrs. SULNER stated that on March 25, 1952, she had received a letter from CHESTER LANE in which he acknowledged receipt of her bill and in which he called her charges nonsensical and indicated he would not pay the bill as rendered. He also added, "To suggest that this conference constituted professional services rendered is nothing short of ridiculous."

Mrs. SULNER advised that she intended to press LANE for the bill; however, the writer advised her that whatever she did in this regard was something that the FBI could in no way advise her.

T. G. SPENCER,
SA

TGS:PAA
65-14920

65-14920-5907

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 9 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

April 9, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

CHESTER T. LANE telephonically communicated with the writer on the afternoon of April 9, 1952, and advised that a few days ago he had received a letter from the USA in which the latter wanted permission from the Landon School officials prior to making any cuttings from the HISS standard (the Landon School letter).

CHESTER LANE advised that he had been in telephonic communication with PAUL BANFIELD, the Headmaster at the Landon School, and although the latter was perfectly willing to allow a piece to be cut from this letter, he thought that he should consult with his Board of Regents since it was a document kept in the regular course of business of the university. He stated that immediately upon receipt of permission to do this he would advise this office.

CHESTER LANE also stated that he had been in touch with Dr. NORMAN and the latter now desires to cut three one-inch pieces from various parts of the envelope that originally contained the Baltimore and other documents. NORMAN also wants permission to slit this envelope down the side so that he may take a photograph of the inside of the envelope.

CHESTER LANE further related that he had been in Boston earlier this week and conferred with his experts, and they told him that they felt it would be quite necessary for them to extend their examination of the documents two or three days past the April 11 deadline. He wanted to know if the Government would concede to this. He stated that the granting of this extra time would in no way affect his filing of his final affidavit on April 21 as has been scheduled by Judge Goddard.

The writer informed CHESTER LANE that the above matters would be taken up with the United States Attorney and he would be advised of the results.

T. G. SPENCER,
SA

TGS:RAA
65-14920

65-14920-5908

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 9 1952	

Spencer
Douglas



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

April 10, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

Re Boston teletype April 9, 1952, 8:55 p.m.

After reviewing the above-described teletype, the writer telephonically contacted Inspector Hennrich at the Bureau at 9:15 a.m., April 10. I told Mr. Hennrich that Mr. Connelley and officials of the United States Attorney's office were opposed to any slitting of the envelope which contained the Baltimore exhibits along the seams of the envelope. I also told Mr. Hennrich that insofar as this office has been advised no extension of time for further study of the exhibits had been granted. I told Mr. Hennrich that the entire matter is to be discussed with the United States Attorney at 2:00 p.m. on April 10, at which time the Bureau and the Boston Office will be advised of the United States Attorney's decision concerning all the requests set forth in the referenced teletype.

At 9:30 a.m. on April 10 I telephonically contacted the Boston Division and advised Supervisor Fred Connors that the Boston Office should take no action concerning the request set forth in our teletype of reference until such time as they were specifically authorized by the New York Office to permit the defense to conduct the investigation requested. I told Connors that in all probability Boston would receive specific instructions by the afternoon of April 10.

T. J. McANDREWS,
SA

TJMCA:RAA
65-14920

65-14920-5970

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 10 1952	

Spencer



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation

New York, N. Y.

April 10, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

On the afternoon of April 10, 1952, the writer conferred with USA Myles Lane in connection with the most recent request made by the defense in connection with the Baltimore papers and other exhibits. MYLES LANE advised:

1. He has no objection to having the defense experts examine the papers for an extended period of two or three days beyond the April 11 deadline that was previously set. In this regard it might be noted that CHESTER LANE has indicated he will have his final affidavit filed on April 21, the day which had been tentatively set for the filing of this paper.

2. MYLES LANE advised that he has no objection to having the defense experts cut five one-inch squares from the envelope in which the Baltimore papers were originally contained.

3. MYLES LANE advised that he would strenuously object to allowing the defense experts to cut this envelope down the side and across the bottom in order that it might be placed on a flat surface for photographic purposes. He stated that if the defense experts can advise the Bureau as to the relevancy and the results that might be obtained from cutting the envelope, and the Bureau experts agree that some purpose could be served in making this experiment, then he would probably agree to having it done; otherwise he would oppose it.

MYLES LANE then advised the writer that he was involved in a murder trial presently being prosecuted in the United States Court House and requested that the writer convey his opinion in this matter to CHESTER LANE, and the writer agreed to do this.

Subsequently on the afternoon of April 10, CHESTER T. LANE was contacted telephonically by the writer, and was advised that the writer was calling at the express request of the United States Attorney in view of the latter's necessary presence in Court, and the writer outlined the remarks and opinions made by MYLES LANE. CHESTER LANE stated that he would communicate with his experts and have the experts reduce to writing the purpose and reasons for cutting this envelope and conducting the experiments which were contemplated.

TGS:RAA
65-14920

65-14920-5911

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 10 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

New York, N. Y.

TGS:RAA
65-14920

4. MYLES LANE stated that under no circumstances would he allow this envelope to be in the custody and possession of the defense experts without Bureau agent being present.

T. G. SPENCER,
SA

New York, N. Y.
4/11/52

MEMO

RE: JAHAM

At 11 a.m. on 4/11/52, CHESTER T. LANE telephonically communicated with the writer. He advised that he had been in telephonic communication with Dr. NORMAN and that Dr. NORMAN had thought it would be more expeditious to have LANE communicate with the New York Office of the FBI rather than his, Dr. NORMAN's, reducing his request to writing and giving it to the Boston Office.

LANE advised that NORMAN has visually examined the inside of the envelope which contained the Baltimore documents and other papers and has come to a definite conclusion that there are stains on the inside of the envelope; further, that these stains are of such a nature that they would have "permeated" any paper or papers that were in close proximity to these stains. He stated that in view of this Dr. NORMAN wanted to take photographs of some magnification in an effort to determine the nature of these stains.

Whether LANE meant to say it or not is not known, but he did state that they were of the opinion that the Baltimore documents never were in this envelope. It would also appear that Dr. NORMAN has examined and photographed the Baltimore documents with a view to determining whether they contain any stains and probably finding none they are in a position to argue that since no stains appear on these papers and stains definitely appear on the inside of the envelope, the Baltimore documents never were inside instant envelope.

This information is being forwarded to the Bureau Laboratory for their opinion, after which the matter will be discussed with the U. S. Attorney.

ADDENDUM: At 3:00 p.m., 4-11-52, CHESTER LANE again telephonically communicated with the writer and advised that he had just received word from Dr. NORMAN that the latter was anxious to look at the four pages of yellow paper containing information alleged by CHAMBERS to have been written by

THOMAS G. SPENCER, SA

cc: Asst. Dir. E. J. Connelley

and received from HARRY DEXTER WHITE. These have been marked Government's Exhibit No. 20 for Identification but were not actually placed in evidence during the second trial. Mr. LANE

was advised that his request would be given to the United States Attorney who would of course have to make the decision on this matter.

65-14920

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 11 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

Handwritten signature

65-14920-5416

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : SAC, NEW YORK (65-14920) ATT: NYO Photo Lab

DATE: April 14, 1952

FROM : SAC, BOSTON (65-3251)

SUBJECT: JAHAM
ESPIONAGE - R; PERJURY

Enclosed for the attention of the Photo Lab of the New York Office is a roll of exposed film containing photographs of Baltimore exhibits 5 through 47, encompassing 65 pages and showing cuts taken from each page by Dr. WILLIAM NORMAN defense expert in captioned case.

The New York Office Photo Lab is requested to develop the enclosed film and designate a copy of each photograph to the New York file in this case. Two copies each are also requested for the Bureau and this office.

Photographic Work
Completed on 4-19-52
By Photo Lab. N. Y. Field Division

FPW:mah

ENC. (Registered Mail)

Film developed
Prints prepared
2 copies of B.
Bureau by reg. mail
11-4-52
JPD.

65-14920-5914

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 15 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

SAC, BOSTON

4/1/52

SA T.G. SPENCER

JAHEM
ESPIONAGE - R

The following exhibits in the ALGER HISS case were turned over to the Boston Office by the writer on April 1, 1952.

Known Specimens

Government Exhibit #37 - A letter dated 6 X11 1931 to Miss HILLINGS signed DAISY FANSLY.

Government Exhibit #34 - A letter dated May 25, 1937 at Washington, D.C. to Mr. W.M. HILLEGEIST signed PRISCILLA FANSLER HISS.

Government Exhibit #39 - President's report for the year 1936 - 1937.

Government Exhibit #46B- Description of personal characteristics of TIMOTHY HOESON.

All of the above mentioned exhibits were placed in evidence in the second trial of ALGER HISS and are what is commonly referred to as the known specimens in this case. These exhibits comprise the known typewriting standards which were used by SA RAMOS FEEHAN, the Bureau Document Examiner, in connection with his testimony regarding the so-called Baltimore papers.

The following exhibit is also a known standard but was not used in the second trial of ALGER HISS and should not be made available to the defense experts. It is being delivered to the Boston Office in view of the fact that it is a known standard. Under no circumstances, unless authorization is received from the Bureau or New York Office, should this exhibit be turned over to the defense experts. This exhibit is described as follows. - A letter, dated February 17, 1933 at New York to WALTER G. SCHEELER and is signed ALGER HISS.

The following are the so-called Baltimore papers. They are represented by Exhibits 1 to 4 inclusive, which are the handwritten notes of ALGER HISS. These handwritten notes should under no circumstances be given to the defense experts, however included in this one particular exhibit.

cc - New York (2) ATT: SA T.G. SPENCER
TGS:plb

65-14920-5922

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 16 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	
<i>Danahy</i>	<i>95</i>

Additional photographs of some of the documents and after examining each of the documents will select 4 or 5 individual documents from which he will take 4 inch squares.

The following procedure is to be followed in connection with this operation. After Dr. NORMAN has selected the particular exhibits he wants pieces cut from, the New York Office should be advised telephonically as to the number and amount. It is to be particularly noted that if Dr. NORMAN wants one square cut from a particular document, there must be an equivalent of the amount he desires left on the document so that if necessary the FBI Laboratory can conduct a similar paper examination. In no instance should any part of the document be given to Dr. NORMAN which contains typewriting markings from the court or any other writing. In other words, if Dr. NORMAN is given a piece of paper it should have no marks on it. After Dr. NORMAN has selected the documents from which he desires these 4 inch squares and it has been cleared by the New York Office, the cutting should be done in the presence of Dr. NORMAN or a person designated by him and this cutting should take place in the Boston Office. After the pieces are cut from the document they should be placed along side of the document and photographed in such a fashion that the entire document will be reproduced together with the piece that is cut from it. Upon completion of the above examination the documents should be returned by personal courier to the New York Office.

In the event that any difficulty is encountered in connection with the examinations by any of the defense experts, the New York Office should be telephonically advised.



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

April 16, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

Inspector Donald Parsons of the Bureau called on the morning of April 16 and advised that the Bureau was just about finished with its examination of the envelope that contained the Baltimore papers and that they were going to put it on a plane before noon, bound for Boston. Parsons stated that he would call this office right after they put it on the plane and advise the flight number so that the Boston Office could be informed and pick the envelope up at Logan Airport. Parsons suggested that the writer communicate with the Boston Office and advise them of the above.

The writer subsequently spoke to SA Frank Willette of Boston and advised him of the above. He stated that he would arrange to pick up the envelope at Logan Airport and make it available to the defense experts.

T. G. SPENCER,
SA

TGS:RAA
65-14920 (#1)

65-14920-5924

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 16 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

Danahy



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

April 16, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

Inspector Donald Parsons of the Bureau called and advised that the envelope which had originally contained the Baltimore papers was being sent AMSD registered to Boston and that the mail was scheduled to leave on American Air Lines flight 4-358 leaving Washington at 12:20 p.m. and arriving at Logan Airport, Boston, at 3:58 p.m.

At the request of Inspector Parsons the writer called Bob Lawrence at the Boston Office and advised him of the above, and suggested that they expedite the receipt of the above-mentioned envelope so that it could be turned over to the defense for examination.

T. G. SPENCER,
SA

TGS:RAA
65-14920

65-14920-5925

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 16 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

Donahy



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

April 22, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

On April 22, 1952, the writer informed Inspector Hennrich of the Bureau that the defense had filed a second supplemental affidavit in the HISS case, and Inspector Hennrich suggested that we immediately make a photostatic copy of it and send it by air mail to Washington.

Arrangements were made through the Post Office Inspectors in New York City whereby this mail was taken by Agent P. B. Rolig directly to the Air Mail Post Office Section at Idlewild Airport. It was put on American Air Lines trip No. 313 which left at 2:10 p.m. and which is scheduled to arrive in Washington at 3:30 p.m. The package was put in the "Direct City Mail Bag."

Inspector Hennrich was advised of the departure of this package.

T. G. SPENCER,
SA

TGS:RAA
65-14920

65-14920-593

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 22 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

[Handwritten signature]



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, N. Y.

April 23, 1952

MEMORANDUM

Re: JAHAM

On April 22, 1952, the writer interviewed Judge Thomas Murphy on another matter. During the interview Judge Murphy advised that on April 21 he had been to a small dinner party given by GILBERT MONTAGUE, an extremely wealthy New York lawyer.

At the dinner party was a Mrs. PRATT, an 80-year-old woman who, according to Judge Murphy, appeared to be a very prominent and wealthy individual. Judge Murphy was seated next to Mrs. PRATT during the dinner, and the conversation drifted to the ALGER HISS case.

Mrs. PRATT stated that she had been talking to JOHN W. DAVIS (prominent New York attorney) who was a character witness for HISS during the first trial. Mrs. PRATT stated that DAVIS had told her that he had read a copy of the defense's motion for a new trial, particularly that portion of it dealing with a metallurgist who had made some studies and performed some examinations on the HISS typewriter. DAVIS stated that from his reading of this metallurgist's report (Dr. NORMAN) he was of the opinion that the Government had "gotten the wrong guy."

Mrs. PRATT also, during the dinner, told Judge Murphy that she was a close personal friend of IRVING OLDS, Chairman of the Board of U. S. Steel, and that OLDS in commenting on the HISS case had indicated that he had figured HISS to be a wrong guy for a long period of time. He stated that everyone made a big to do about HISS' having at one time been secretary to former Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. OLDS is supposed to have said that he too was at one time secretary to Holmes, and the former secretaries of Holmes have formed the practice of getting together once a year; he stated that even in those days he had figured HISS for an impertinent pusher and definitely on the wrong side of the fence politically. OLDS is also supposed to have stated that he, OLDS, received a very substantial yearly salary and a good portion of it was paid to him because of his judgment in dealing with men and situations which involved investments of many millions of dollars. OLDS is supposed to have stated that for his, OLDS', money ALGER HISS was a 'wrong guy.'

TGS:RAA
65-14920

FILE STRIPPED *per N.Y. Insp. & SA T. S. Spunar*
BY TM ON 3-29-62

65-14920-5936

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 23 1952	
FBI - NEW YORK	

Danahy

TGS:RAA
65-14920

New York, N. Y.

Judge Murphy stated that he is of the definite opinion that the defense has been circulating printed copies of the motion for a new trial among people who had been favorable to HISS, probably in an effort to raise funds to carry on the program of obtaining a new trial for HISS.

T. G. SPENCER,
SA